

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, if we are going to remain competitive in the global economy, we must invest in clean energy innovation.

San Diego has 767 clean energy companies, and has become an innovation hub, especially in solar power, energy storage and advanced biofuels. According to the San Diego Association of Governments, the algae energy section alone—one energy section—provides the region with 410 direct jobs and \$108 million in economic activity each year.

Unfortunately, the appropriations bill we're voting on this week cuts solar energy research by more than one-third; decreases biomass research by \$33 million; and cuts \$80 million from funding for breakthrough domestic clean energy innovators.

We can't hold back the companies that have come up with the answers to our serious energy problems. I hope my colleagues will join me in fighting for cleantech and biotech innovation by opposing this damaging bill.

#### PUTTING PARTISANSHIP ASIDE TO CREATE JOBS FOR THIS NATION

(Mr. CLEAVER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, we are now on day 191 of the new Congress. Sadly, I must report to the people of my congressional district and to this Nation that we have done absolutely nothing with regard to creating jobs. Rather than spending time trying to blame George Bush and Barack Obama, I think we ought to utilize every moment we have to create opportunities to work.

We are in a crisis: 9.2 unemployment overall, 16.2 African American unemployment. If you add what the Labor Department does, which is something called U-6, African American unemployment is at 30 percent.

This Congress owes it to this Nation to move the partisanship aside and to create jobs for this Nation.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the further consideration of H.R. 2354 and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

#### ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 337 and rule

XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2354.

□ 1239

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2354) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, with Mrs. BIGGERT (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, July 13, 2011, the bill had been read through page 62, line 2.

Mr. OLVER. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Madam Chairman, title V of the Energy and Water bill that is before us today robs Peter to pay Paul.

Title V takes funds which were appropriated 2½ years ago for transportation purposes and moves part of those funds to the Corps of Engineers in today's Energy and Water appropriations bill. Title V specifically rescinds all awarded but unobligated high-speed rail dollars from the Recovery and Reinvestment Act and moves those dollars to respond to the unprecedented flooding this spring in many States for work to be done as it is designed and executed by the Corps of Engineers.

Effectively this is a backhanded increase in allocation to the Energy and Water Subcommittee for this bill at the expense of transportation purposes.

I don't contend or even suggest that the Energy and Water bill is well-funded. In fact, the allocations for the Energy and Water Subcommittee and for the Transportation and HUD Subcommittee, of which I am the ranking member, are both totally inadequate. But I do object to killing projects in transportation that will create construction jobs in the severely depressed construction industry and provide a valuable transportation alternative in heavily congested corridors among our largest metropolitan areas all over the country. And I do absolutely support making the repairs to flood control systems as quickly as they can be designed and built. That's an obligation.

In my 20 years, 10½ years under Democratic Presidents, 9½ years under Republican Presidents and under the control in the Congress of either party—because it switched back and forth in those 20 years—we have dealt with natural disasters on a bipartisan basis, on an emergency basis, every single year. Most famously, that includes, in September '05, the Katrina disaster which resulted in \$15 billion for recovery of New Orleans and the gulf coast on an emergency and on a

totally bipartisan basis. But this section takes from projects planned, applied for and awarded but not yet obligated and kills those projects.

Roughly \$6 billion of the \$8 billion appropriated for intercity passenger rail and high-speed rail projects in the Recovery Act are already obligated, and half of those are already in construction. The Recovery Act itself allowed until the 30th of September of 2012, the end of the '12 fiscal year, to obligate those dollars. Of the roughly \$2 billion unobligated, 80 percent of those dollars arises from the single decision just 3 months ago of the Governor of Florida to refuse the \$1.6 billion previously applied for and awarded for a project to build true high-speed rail on a dedicated corridor between Orlando and Tampa.

Now, Orlando lies roughly equidistant from Jacksonville, Tampa and Miami. Those four, Jacksonville, Tampa, Miami and Orlando, are four of America's 40 largest metropolitan areas. All have over 1½ million people, all are growing by between 15 and 30 percent, and they are among our fastest growing metropolitan areas. They represent a prime example of the opportunity that high-speed rail offers in carefully selected high-population corridors around the country to reduce congestion and expedite travel.

When that money was refused by Florida, the Federal Rail Administration re-awarded the \$1.6 billion to projects in other States, including, as examples, in the Northeast Corridor, which carries half of all intercity rail passengers in America every day, nearly \$800 million for work in that Northeast Corridor, and that work would bring the speed up to 160 miles per hour in parts of New Jersey, and the work would be done in New York and New Jersey. So that is \$800 million.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. OLVER. I ask unanimous consent to be given 1 additional minute.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I object.

The Acting CHAIR. Objection is heard.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. OLVER. Secondly, in the high-speed corridors that are based on Chicago as their hub, to go to Detroit, to go to St. Louis, to go to Indianapolis, to go to Milwaukee, for equipment that will allow those high-speed corridors to function better.

Thirdly, in projects on the west coast as well. All of those projects are jeopardized by this provision in this bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Chair, I am opposed to the misguided cuts to high-speed rail funding in this bill that